

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
MACON DIVISION

MARQUISE ROBBINS,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
v.	:	No. 5:13-CV-348 (CAR)
	:	
SHEILA OUBRE, <i>et al.</i> ,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	
_____	:	

**ORDER ON MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Before the Court is Plaintiff Marquise Robbins' "Objections" [Doc. 84] to the Magistrate Judge's orders [Docs. 6, 74, 82] denying his numerous requests for appointment of counsel [Docs. 3, 73, 80]. The Court construes Plaintiff's "Objections" as a Motion for Reconsideration.

Local Rule 7.6 cautions that "[m]otions for reconsideration shall not be filed as a matter of routine practice."<sup>1</sup> "Reconsideration is appropriate 'only if the movant demonstrates (1) that there has been an intervening change in the law, (2) that new evidence has been discovered which was not previously available to the parties in the exercise of due diligence, or (3) that the court made a clear error of law.'"<sup>2</sup> Importantly, "[a] motion for reconsideration does not provide an opportunity to simply reargue the

---

<sup>1</sup> M.D. Ga., L.R. 7.6.

<sup>2</sup> *Bingham v. Nelson*, No. 508CV246 (CAR), 2010 WL 339806, at \*1 (M.D. Ga. Jan. 21, 2010) (quoting *McCoy v. Macon Water Authority*, 966 F. Supp. 1209, 1222–23 (M.D. Ga. 1997)).

issue the Court has once determined.”<sup>3</sup>

Here, Plaintiff has failed to show that reconsideration of the Magistrate Judge’s orders is appropriate on any of the three grounds listed above. There is nothing in Plaintiff’s Motion showing that the law has changed or that new evidence has been discovered. Moreover, the Magistrate Judge’s orders are not clearly erroneous or unjust. In support of his Motion, Plaintiff simply rehashes the same arguments previously considered by the Magistrate Judge. Therefore, no grounds exist for reconsideration.

Accordingly, Plaintiff’s Motion for Reconsideration [Doc. 84] is **DENIED**.

**SO ORDERED**, this 10th day of December, 2014.

S/ C. Ashley Royal  
C. ASHLEY ROYAL  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

ADP

---

<sup>3</sup> *Pennamon v. United Bank*, No. 5:09-CV-169 (CAR), 2009 WL 2355816, at \*1 (M.D. Ga. July 28, 2009) (quotation omitted).